

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ALIH AGUDA,

Plaintiff,

V.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:25-cv-00752-LK

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Alih Aguda’s Motion for Temporary Restraining Order. Dkt. No. 15. The precise nature of the relief he seeks is unclear. *See, e.g., id.* at 7 (seeking “freedom from the government violation of [his] rights, especially [his] right to privacy”).

More fundamentally, Mr. Aguda is not entitled to emergency relief because he has not filed a viable complaint in this matter. The Court dismissed his complaint with leave to amend, Dkt. No. 9, and he has not yet filed an amended complaint, *see* Dkt. Nos. 14, 16 (motions for extensions of time to file an amended complaint). “[T]he Court cannot address a motion premised on a

1 nonexistent complaint with nonexistent claims for relief.” *Simmons v. Alston*, No. 2:23-CV-01076-
2 LK, 2023 WL 4704745, at *2 (W.D. Wash. July 24, 2023); *see also Frick v. Dy*, No. C22-801-
3 JHC-MLP, 2022 WL 4348567, at *1 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 23, 2022) (plaintiff’s motion for a TRO
4 was not properly before the court because he had not filed an operative complaint), *report and*
5 *recommendation adopted*, 2022 WL 4315689 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 19, 2022).¹

6 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Mr. Aguda’s Motion for Temporary Restraining Order.
7 Dkt. No. 15.

8 Dated this 1st day of August, 2025.

9 
10 Lauren King
11 United States District Judge

23
24

¹ In addition, Mr. Aguda has not certified that he provided Defendant with notice of this motion or otherwise satisfied
the conditions to seek a TRO without notice to the opposing party. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1); LCR 65(b)(1).